



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/719,739	11/20/2003	Tomoki Ono	245402008000	3121
25226	7590	07/27/2006	EXAMINER	
MORRISON & FOERSTER LLP 755 PAGE MILL RD PALO ALTO, CA 94304-1018			RAO, SHRINIVAS H	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2814	

DATE MAILED: 07/27/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Advisory Action
Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief**

Application No.

10/719,739

Applicant(s)

ONO ET AL.

Examiner

Steven H. Rao

Art Unit

2814

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 19 July 2006 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.

1. ☒ The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:

- a) ☐ The period for reply expires _____ months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
b) ☒ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.

Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

NOTICE OF APPEAL

2. ☐ The Notice of Appeal was filed on _____. A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).

AMENDMENTS

3. ☒ The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because
(a) ☐ They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
(b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);
(c) ☒ They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
(d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: _____. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).

4. ☐ The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).
5. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): _____.
6. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) _____ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).
7. ☒ For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) ☒ will not be entered, or b) ☐ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:
Claim(s) allowed: _____.
Claim(s) objected to: _____.
Claim(s) rejected: 1-18.
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: _____.

AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE

8. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will not be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).
9. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.

REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER

11. ☐ The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: _____
12. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08 or PTO-1449) Paper No(s). _____
13. ☒ Other: See Continuation Sheet.

Continuation of 13. Other: Applicants' first contention that the applied Papayoanou reference was patented in 70s whereas the Saito and Yoshida references were patented in 90s and therefore cannot be combined is wrong, it is noted present law requires all references no matter how old can be combined. Applicants' contention that Papayoanou and Saito & Yoshida cannot be combined because of differences in material, structure, mechanism of laser irradiation, application and method of manufacturing all of which are not presently recited in only independent claim 1. Therefore Applicants' arguments are not commensurate in scope with the presently recited claims. Further some of alleged differences e.g. application and method of manufacturing cannot be considered in device claims unless recited in proper format. The motivation to combine Papayoanou, Saito and Yoshida references (as stated in the final rejection) can be found at least in Papayoanou _Abstract last two lines and Saito col.1 lines 41-55, etc. Applicants' contention that Papayoanou's cavity must be distinguished from Applicants' cavity is also not consummate in scope from Applicants' presently recited claims, wherein " optical cavity" is not further defined to exclude any filling therein or the presence/ absence of additional materials. Further the allegation Papayoanou's cavity is used only for occasional tuning whereas Applicants' cavity emits a laser beam is presently not recited in claims and need be given patentable weight. Further functional recitation cannot be given patentable weight unless claims recite sufficient structure to warrant the presence of functional language. Applicants' last contention that Papayoanou allegedly does not teach electrodes having two regions is engaging in impressible piece meal analysis. Applicants' are reminded that as the other applied references namely Yoshida (as also stated in the rejection- figs. 1B, 3C, col. 7 lines 50-65, col. 8 lines 55-65, etc.) teach electrodes having two regions and Papayoanou need not repeat this teaching. Therefore all of Applicants' are not persuasive. .



Steven Rao
Patent Examiner
July 120/2006



LONG PHAM
PRIMARY EXAMINER